

ARGUMENTS

1.) Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended claims 1, 7, 14, 21, 29, and 30 and claims 22 and 23 have been canceled. Accordingly, claims 1-21, 24-30 and 35-37 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 14, 29, and 30 to better define the intended scope of the claimed invention. Specifically the independent claims have been amended to include: a maximum thickness of the thread occurring at a point closer to the crest of the thread than the root of the thread. Support for this element can be found throughout the specification, including Figure 4.

Applicant has amended claim 21 to better define the intended scope of the claimed invention. Specifically the claim has been amended to include: the distance between the rearward peak and the forward peak provides a maximum thickness of the thread; wherein the maximum thickness of the thread occurs at a point closer to the crest of the thread than the root of the thread. Support for this element can be found throughout the specification, including Figure 4.

2.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112


The Examiner rejected claims 1-30 and 35-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner states:

In claims 1, 14, 21, 29, and 30, the screw form regarding the rearward facing thread is unclear. Applicant states “a rearward-facing thread surface having a substantially straight sloped portion and at least two non-contiguous curve portions, such that a point on the rearward-facing thread surface at a root of the thread surface at a root of the thread surface is farther from the forward end than a point on the rearward-facing thread surface at a crest of the thread surface at a crest of the thread surface when measured along a line parallel to the longitudinal

axis.” However, based on Figure 4, i.e., the figure cited by applicant in support of the amendments to the claims, the rearward-facing thread surface has a substantially straight sloped portion and at least two non-contiguous curve portions, such that a point on the rearward-facing thread surface at a root of the thread surface appears to be closer to (not farther from) the forward end than a point on the rearward-facing thread surface at a crest of the thread surface when measured along a line parallel to the longitudinal axis. Appropriate correction is required.

The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Figure 4 is reproduced below and illustrates one embodiment of the claimed invention.



A crest is defined as the ridge or surface farthest from the body of the object and defined by the flanks of the thread (Random House Unabridged Dictionary, 2006). Thus, the crest, or farthest surface from the body of the screw, is the surface of the thread that corresponds to the line T_C in Figure 4. The point on the rearward-facing thread surface at the crest (in other words, point “A”). Similarly, a point at the root would correspond to a point at the root (in other words, point “B”). Thus, the point on the rearward-facing thread surface at the root (e.g., Point B) is farther from the forward end than the point on the rearward-facing thread at the crest (e.g. Point A).

Therefore the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is improper and the Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner states:

In claims 7, 30, 35, 36, and 37, the screw form regarding the rearward facing thread is unclear. Applicant states “a forward-facing thread surface having a substantially straight sloped portion and at least two non-contiguous curve portions, such that a point on the forward-facing thread surface at a root of the forward-facing thread surface is closer to the forward end than a point on the forward-facing thread surface at a crest of the forward-facing thread surface when measured along a line parallel to the longitudinal axis.” However, based on Figure 4, i.e., the figure cited by applicant in support of the amendments to the claims, the forward-facing thread surface has a substantially straight sloped portion and at least two non-contiguous curve portions, such that a point on the forward-facing thread surface at a root of the forward facing thread surface appears to be farther from (not closer to) the forward end than a point on the forward-facing thread surface at a crest of the forward-facing thread surface when measured along a line parallel to the longitudinal axis. Appropriate correction is required.

The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. As seen in Figure 4, the curved portions are not the farthest ridge or surface from the body of the screw. The farthest surface from the body of the screw is the surface of the thread that corresponds to the line T_C in Figure 4. The point on the forward-facing thread surface at the crest would be the point that corresponds to the highest point on the length line T_C . Thus, the point on the forward-facing thread surface at the root is closer to the forward end from the point on the forward-facing thread at the crest.

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is improper and the Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

3.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 10-30 and 35-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Jackson (US 6,726,689). The Applicant has amended claims 1, 14, 21, 29 and

30 to better define the intended scope of the claimed invention. The Examiner's consideration of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

The Applicant has amended claims 1, 14, 21, 29 and 30 to include the limitation that a maximum thickness of the thread occurs at a point closer to the crest of the thread than the root of the thread. Applicant respectfully submits that Jackson fails to disclose this feature. The thread in Figure 5, the Figure cited by the Examiner, does not show that the maximum thickness occurs at a point closer to the crest than the root. Each thread embodiment of Jackson (Figures 4-14) fails to disclose all of the features of each of the independent claims 1, 14, 21, 29, and 30.

All the elements of claims 1, 14, 21, 29, and 30 are not taught by Jackson. Because all of the elements are not taught by Jackson, a 102 rejection is not proper. The Applicant respectfully requests that the 102 rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2-13, 15-20, 24-28, and 35-37 depend from amended claims 1, 14, 21, and 29 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claims 1, 14, 21, and 29. Therefore, the allowance of claims 2-13, 15-20, 24-28 and 35-37 is also respectfully requested.

4.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

The Examiner rejected claims 8-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jackson (US 6,726,689)

The Applicant has amended claim 1 to better define the intended scope of the claimed invention. Claims 8 and 9 depend from claim 1. The Examiner has not established that Jackson discloses each and every element of claim 1, particularly that a maximum thickness of the thread occurs at a point closer to the crest of the thread than the root of the thread. The 103 fails to correct the deficiencies of Jackson. Therefore, the 103 is improper and should be withdrawn.

REMARKS


In view of the above, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge Deposit Account No. 06-2380, under Order No. 65677/P004US/10403105 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: October 20, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Craig J. Cox

Registration No.: 39,643

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.

2200 Ross Avenue, Suite 2800

Dallas, Texas 75201-2784

(214) 855-7142

(214) 855-8200 (Fax)

Attorney for Applicant